



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/676,319	09/29/2000	Ernie F. Brickell	10559-329001/P9832	1992
20985 7590 02/01/2008 FISH & RICHARDSON, PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER HENNING, MATTHEW T	
			ART UNIT 2131	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/01/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/676,319

Applicant(s)

BRICKELL ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew T. Henning

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 42-46, 48-54, 56, 58-62, 64-66, 69 and 70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 42-46, 48-54, 56, 58-62, 64-66, 69 and 70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 September 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/15/2007.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2131

1 This action is in response to the communication filed on 1/09/2008.

2 **DETAILED ACTION**

3 ***Response to Arguments***

4 Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 42-46, 48-54, 56, 58-62, 64-66, and 69-70
5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6 The examiner notes that the objections to the specification, and claims, as well as the
7 rejection of claims 48, 56, and 64, were previously presented, and have not been addressed by
8 the applicants. As such, the examiner has maintained these objections and rejections.

9 All objections and rejections not presented below have been withdrawn.

10 Claims 42-46, 48-54, 56, 58-62, 64-66, and 69-70 have been examined.

11 ***Information Disclosure Statement***

12 The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 11/15/2007 is in compliance
13 with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being
14 considered by the examiner.

15 ***Specification***

16 The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the
17 claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the
18 following is required: In this case, the applicant has not pointed out support for a second relying
19 party, as recited in claims 48, 56, and 64. Further, the examiner has been unable to find support
20 for this limitation in the specification as originally filed. See the rejection of claims 48, 56, and
21 64 under 35 USC 112 1st Paragraph below.

22 ***Claim Objections***

Art Unit: 2131

Claim 62 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 62 recites "the authentication server" which lacks antecedent basis in the claim. It appears that this should have been amended to read "the authentication service", as was done to claims 58-65. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 48, 56, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In this case, the applicant has not pointed out support for a second relying party, as recited in claims 48, 56, and 64. Further, the examiner has been unable to find support for this limitation in the specification as originally filed. As such, the claims are rejected for failing to meet the written description requirement of 35 USC 112 1st Paragraph. The claims have been examined in view of the prior art below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

Art Unit: 2131

1 *ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be*
2 *negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*
3

4 Claims 42-46, 48-54, 56, 58-62, 64-66, and 69-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as
5 being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (US Patent Number 6,021,202) hereinafter referred to as
6 Anderson, and further in view of Saito et al. (US Patent Number 6,275,941) hereinafter referred
7 to as Saito, and further in view of Joao et al. (US Patent Number 6,047,270) hereinafter referred
8 to as Joao.

9 Regarding claims 42, 50, and 58, Anderson disclosed a machine-implemented method
10 (See Anderson Fig. 26) comprising: relying on digital credential information (Signature and
11 digital certificate) by a relying party (Third 468) wherein the digital credential information is
12 indicative of a first user being professionally licensed (Doctor 462) but has been received by the
13 relying party from an unauthorized user (See Anderson Fig. 26 and Col. 39 Line 21 – Col. 40
14 Line 11 and Col. 27 Paragraph 4 wherein it is implied that not all of the uses of the signature
15 card are necessarily legitimate and as such it is obvious that an unauthorized user could have
16 used it to provide the signature credentials); verifying that the digital credential information is
17 valid using the professional license status information that has been stored for a plurality of users
18 (See Anderson Col. 11 Paragraph 2); and providing information to the first user, the information
19 indicative of receipt of valid digital credential information from the relying party (See Anderson
20 Col. 40 Lines 8-10 and Col. 24 Lines 38-50); wherein the relying party, the unauthorized user,
21 and the first user are distinct from each other (See Anderson Fig. 26 and Col. 27 Paragraph 4),
22 but Anderson failed to disclose how to verify the digital credential information, or specifically an
23 authentication service, which receives the credential information from the relying party, provides
24 the verification information indicative of a valid professional license status of the first user from

Art Unit: 2131

1 to the relying party; or provides, to the first user, the information indicative of receipt of valid
2 digital credential information from the relying party.

3 Saito teaches a system for verifying digital credential information including digital
4 certificates of a user (See Saito Fig. 5 and Col. 7 Lines 5-55) involving an authentication service
5 (authentication server), receiving digital credential information (integrated certificate) associated
6 with a first user (client) from a relying party (application server) (See Saito Col. 7 Lines 21-24);
7 verifying the digital credential information associated with the first user to the relying party (See
8 Saito Col. 7 Lines 25-36); providing verification information associated with the first user to the
9 relying party (See Saito Col. 7 Lines 36-52); and providing information from the authentication
10 service to the first user, the information indicative of receiving the digital credential information
11 associated with the first user from the relying party (See Saito Col. 7 Lines 36 – Col. 8 Line 8).

12 Joao teaches that in a card transaction system, in order to prevent fraudulent use of the
13 account associated with the card, a central party will verify the status of the account, and if the
14 account is valid, the central party will transmit a signal, to a cardholder designated in the
15 account, via telephone, computer, beeper, etc. notifying the cardholder of the transaction, at
16 which point the cardholder may stop the transaction by transmitting a response to the signal (See
17 Joao Figs. 3A-3C and Col. 18 Line 60 - Col. 22 Line 56).

18 It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
19 invention to employ the teachings of Saito in the network prescription issuing system of
20 Anderson by utilizing an authentication server as taught by Saito to verify the digital signatures,
21 digital certificates, and license statuses of Anderson upon the request of one of the relying third

Art Unit: 2131

1 parties. This would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been
2 motivated to provide means for verifying this data as required by Anderson.

3 It further would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art at the time of
4 invention to employ the teachings of Joao in the system of Anderson and Saito by having the
5 authentication server (central party), upon successfully verifying the status of the license,
6 sending a signal to the Doctor designated for the account, notifying the Doctor of the transaction,
7 at which point the Doctor could respond to the signal and prevent the transaction from occurring.
8 This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been
9 motivated to prevent the fraudulent use of the prescription issuing system of Anderson.

10 Regarding claims 43, 51, and 59, the combination of Anderson, Saito, and Joao disclosed
11 providing access to an activity log associated with the first user (See Anderson Col. 40 Lines 8-
12 10 and Col. 24 Lines 38-50 and further see Joao Col. 20 Lines 16-47).

13 Regarding claims 44-45, 52-53, and 60-61, the combination of Anderson, Saito, and Joao
14 disclosed that the professional license status information comprises registration information
15 indicative of a professional license registration status with a registration authority (See Anderson
16 Col 11 Paragraph 2), and the method further comprises, prior to providing the verification
17 information to the relying party, verifying the registration information with the registration
18 authority (See Anderson Col. 11 Paragraph 2 and the rejection of claim 42 above).

19 Regarding claims 46, 54, and 62, the combination of Anderson, Saito, and Joao disclosed
20 storing access information associated with the relying party, the access information including
21 information indicative of the providing the verification information (See Joao Col. 20 Line 37 -

Art Unit: 2131

1 Col. 21 Line 58); and providing the access information to the relying party (See Joao Col. 20
2 Line 37 – Col. 21 Line 58).

3 Regarding claims 48, 56, and 64, the combination of Anderson, Saito, and Joao disclosed
4 providing information indicative of a failure to authenticate the digital credential information
5 associated with the first user to a second relying party (See Saito Col. 7 Lines 36-38 and
6 Anderson Fig. 26).


7 Regarding claims 49, and 65, the combination of Anderson, Saito, and Joao disclosed at
8 least one of the relying party and the authentication service issuing a challenge in response to
9 receiving digital credential information associated with the first user (See Saito Col. 7 Lines 21-
10 24).

11 Regarding claim 66, the combination of Anderson, Saito, and Joao disclosed receiving, at
12 the relying party, the valid digital credential information from an unauthorized user (See
13 Anderson Col. 27 Paragraph 4 wherein it is implied that not all of the uses of the signature card
14 are necessarily legitimate and as such it is obvious that an unauthorized user could have used it
15 to provide the signature credentials).

16 Regarding claim 69, the combination of Anderson, Saito, and Joao disclosed that the
17 information is provided from the authentication service to the first user in response to the relying
18 party having received the valid digital credential information from an unauthorized user (See
19 Anderson Col. 27 Paragraph 4 wherein it is implied that not all of the uses of the signature card
20 are necessarily legitimate and as such it is obvious that an unauthorized user could have used it
21 to provide the signature credentials).

Art Unit: 2131

1 /Matthew Henning/
2 Assistant Examiner
3 Art Unit 2131
4 1/29/2008


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100